

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION N	O. 1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,840	_	10/23/2003	Hitomi Ushitani	0756-7213	5406
31780	7590	08/18/2005		EXAM	INER
ERIC RC	BINSON		LEE, GRANVILL D		
PMB 955 21010 SOUTHBANK ST.				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
POTOMA	OTOMAC FALLS, VA 20165			2891	
				DATE MAILED: 08/18/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/690,840	USHITANI ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Granvill D. Lee Jr	2891					
The MAILING DATE of this communicatio Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicati  - If the period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory i  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37.CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re on. , a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT statute. cause the application to become ABA	ply be timely filed  (30) days will be considered timely.  HS from the mailing date of this communication.					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	28 June 2005.						
<u> </u>	This action is non-final.						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8 and 12-27</u> is/are pending in a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wit 5) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>2,4-8,13,15-19,21 and 23-27</u> is/a 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3</u> is/are rejected.  7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>12,14,20 and 22</u> is/are objected 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	thdrawn from consideration.  are allowed.  to.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Exa  10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)  Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the control of the section of the section is a bijected to be set to be section.	accepted or b) objected to be the drawing(s) be held in abeyand orrection is required if the drawing(s)	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	ne Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action of form P1O-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		·					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International B * See the attached detailed Office action for	ments have been received. ments have been received in Ap e priority documents have been i ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage					
Attachment(s)  1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Su	ummary (PTO-413)					
<ul> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/28/2005.</li> </ul>	8) Paper No(s)	//Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Application/Control Number: 10/690,840

Art Unit: 2891

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Applicant's Argument

After review of applicant's amendments and comments, the examiner finds such arguments unpersuasive. Applicant's comments as to Nakamura et al. are well taken, however in further review of the prior art, the examiner has found that Taft et al. read upon applicant's claimed invention. As these are a new grounds for rejection necessitated by applicant's amended claimed invention, and they are not to be considered a final rejections of the claims.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taft et al. (US Pat. 5,300,454).

In regard to these claims, Taft et al. teaches a method for manufacturing a semiconductor apparatus comprising the steps of:

forming a semiconductor over a substrate (Fig. 17 #12),

forming a mask (#14) comprising a resist (Col. 2 lines 50-55) over the semiconductor to overlap with a portion of the semiconductor (Fig. 17), and

adding an impurity element to the semiconductor in accordance with the mask by a doping method (Abstr.). However, Taft et al. fails to consider an area of the mask is at most 15% (or 35% in re clm. 3) of the area of the substrate.

Yet, Taft et al. teaches that for a high or low masking percentage (or ratio of mask to wafer area) deeper or shallow implants can be formed, respectively (Col. 4 lines 1-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Taft et al. to include the idea of optimizing high or low masking percentages versus depth, in order to teach the specific percentage needed for a particular desired implant depth. In this way any shallow junctions or deep implants could be made more reliably, based on mask area (Col. 4 lines 1-25).

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 12, 14, 20 and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 2, 4-8, 13, 15-19, 21 and 23-27 are allowable.

substrate.

Reasons for allowance are based on the fact that the prior art fails to teach an implantation method doping a substrate with an acceleration voltage, in an area of the mask is a predetermined percentage of the area of the

### **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications for the examiner should be directed to Granvill Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-1897. The examiner can be normally reached on Monday thru Friday from 6:00 am to 2:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are not successful, the examiner's supervisor, Bill Baumeister can be reached on (571) 272-1722. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner Granvill Lee Art Unit 2891

> B. WILLIAM BAUMEISTER SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER